UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/816,063	03/31/2004	Hitoshi Yamamoto	2271/71538	8897	
23432 COOPER & DI	7590 08/14/200 UNHAM, LLP	7	EXAMINER		
1185 AVENUE	OF THE AMERICAS		MISIURA, BRIAN THOMAS		
NEW YORK, 1	A I 10030		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2111		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/14/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	10/816,063	YAMAMOTO ET A
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit
	Brian T. Misiura	2111

Advisory Action	10/816,063	YAMAMOTO ET AL.					
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Brian T. Misiura	2111					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>30 July 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.					
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee lave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee inder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as et forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, hay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief,	, will <u>not</u> be entered b	ecause				
(a) ☑ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
(c) ☑ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or			the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		umpliant Amendment	(PTOL_324)				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		impliant Amendment	(FTOL-324).				
5. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) 64,68, and 72 (35		i <u>ection)</u> would be allow	wable if				
submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelin							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		II be entered and an e	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: <u>9,10,20,21,31,32,42,52,62,65-67,69</u>	9-71 and 73-75.						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8.11-19.22-30.33-41.43-51.53-61.64</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	it before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affidat	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is	ot be entered s necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attacl	hed.				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet. 	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).	,					
	DARK H. RINEHART						
SUPERVISORY PATEST EXAMINER							
TECHNINOGY CENTER 2100							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant's arguments against the rejection of Claims 1, 12, 23, 34, 44, and 54 have been presented with a new claim limitation(s). The added limitation(s), particularly "for controlling connections of PC cards with a host computer" and "to connect the PC card connector to a bus interface of said host computer", narrow the scope of the claims in a way that have yet been considered with the present references cited.

BYM 8/7/2007